



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,107	02/13/2001	Mihal Lazaridis	555255012189	3129

7590

03/27/2003

David B. Cochran, Esq.
Jones, Day, Reavis & Pogue
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114

EXAMINER

EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 03/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/782,107

Applicant(s)

LAZARIDIS ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley Edelman

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 35-41 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34, 42 and 43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 February 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2-10, 15, 16
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 17.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

This is a first office action on the merits of this case. Claims 1-43 are presented for examination. Claims 35-41 have been withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Examiner has reviewed Applicant's response to the 35 U.S.C. 105 requirement sent on June 18, 2002, and has found Applicant's response to be sufficient.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-34, and 42-43 drawn to a system for redirecting messages from a host system to a mobile device, classified in class 709, subclass 253.
 - II. Claims 35-41, drawn to a system for performing a search query on a server from a remote mobile device, classified in class 709, subclass 219.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention I has separate utility such as keeping traveling users aware of their most recent e-mails, while invention II has separate utility such as allowing remote users to look up information on the Internet.

See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with David Cochran on March 5, 2003 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of I, claims 1-34, and 42-43. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 35-41 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Objections

2. Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities: On line 6 of the claim, the phrase "communication device by: and," contains incorrect grammar.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2153

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

3. Claims 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,084,969, hereinafter "Wright").

In considering claim 30, Wright discloses a method of securely exchanging messages between a host system and a wireless mobile data communication device via a wireless network, comprising the steps of:

Providing a wireless redirector component for coupling the host system and the wireless device ("gateway server," col. 8, lines 37-43);

Establishing an end-to-end, bi-directional secure link between the host system and the wireless mobile data communication device by providing a first encryption module at the host system for encrypting messages and a corresponding decryption module at the mobile device for decrypting the messages, wherein the messages remain encrypted once transmitted until received by the mobile device, whereby messages are exchanged between the host system and the wireless device via the secure link (col. 12, lines 22-26, 48-59).

In considering claim 31, Wright further discloses providing a second encryption module at the mobile device for encrypting messages created at the mobile device,

sending the encrypted messages to the host system, and decrypting the messages at the host (col. 4, lines 15-22; col. 9, lines 11-25, 35-55).

In considering claims 32 and 33, Wright further discloses a message server for receiving and storing messages according to user accounts (e-mail server) and further discloses the use of encryption/decryption keys at the host and the mobile device (col. 7, line 39 – col. 8, line 21; col. 8, lines 37-66).

4. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Frith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,426, hereinafter "Frith").

In considering claim 30, Frith discloses a method of securely exchanging messages between a host system and a wireless mobile data communication device via a wireless network, comprising the steps of:

Providing a wireless redirector component (sending gateway) for coupling the host system and the wireless device (col. 1, lines 11-15; col. 2, lines 40-56);

Establishing an end-to-end, bi-directional secure link between the host system and the wireless mobile data communication device by providing a first encryption module at the host system for encrypting messages and a corresponding decryption module at the mobile device for decrypting the messages, wherein the messages remain encrypted once transmitted until received by the mobile device, whereby messages are exchanged between the host system and the wireless device via the secure link (col. 7, lines 5-17).

In considering claim 31, Frith further discloses providing a second encryption module at the mobile device for encrypting messages created at the mobile device, sending the encrypted messages to the host system, and decrypting the messages at the host (col. 7, lines 5-17; col. 2, lines 58-61, wherein any node may create a message, which is then encrypted).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,995,597, hereinafter "Woltz"), in view of Wright, and further in view of Nakanura (U.S. Patent No. 5,548,789).

In considering claim 1, Woltz discloses an electronic message redirection system, comprising:

A host system (34) having a redirection application, wherein the redirector application is configured to sense a trigger event at the host system and in response to the trigger event to continuously redirect electronic messages from the host system to the mobile data communication device (col. 3, lines 30-45; col. 3, lines 30-34; col. 4,

lines 36-41, wherein the trigger event is the returning of a user from vacation or other absence);

A wired network coupled to the host system, and a wireless data network coupled to the mobile device (Fig. 1); and

A wireless gateway coupled between the wired network and the wireless data network for transmitting messages between the wired network and the wireless network (col. 1, lines 41-47, wherein the "pager companies" which act as an intermediary between the wired and wireless network includes a gateway).

However, Woltz does not discuss the packaging, encryption, and/or compression of messages sent between the host and the mobile device. Nonetheless, packaging, encrypting, and compressing messages sent between a host system and a wireless device, as claimed, is well known, as evidenced by Wright and Nakanura respectively. First, in a similar art, Wright discloses a system for redirecting messages received at a host (pager proxy) connected to a wired network through a gateway (e-mail gateway), to a wireless device (receiving pager) connected to a wireless network (col. 8, lines 37-62; Fig. 1), wherein the messages are packaged and encrypted at the host and remain packaged and encrypted until they reach the destination pager, and wherein the pager extracts the messages, thus establishing a secure electronic message redirection system (col. 7, lines 24-30; col. 8, lines 37-62; col. 9, lines 16-25; col. 12, lines 21-26, 48-59). Second, in a similar art, Nakanura also discloses a message forwarding system, and further discloses that a server may compress messages before forwarding

them to ensure that the receiving device can receive an un-truncated message (Abstract, Fig. 1).

Thus, given the teachings of Wright and Nakanura, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of encrypting, packaging, and compressing the messages redirected from the host to the wireless device in the system taught by Woltz, in order to allow for a secure messaging system (as taught by Wright) and in order to allow users at portable devices to view un-truncated messages (as taught by Nakanura). Compression is further advantageous to reduce network bandwidth usage. Thus, it would have been obvious to include packaging, encryption, and compression, as taught by Wright and Nakanura, in the message redirection system taught by Woltz.

In considering claim 7, claim 7 and the claims from which claim 7 depends contain no further limitations over claim 1, and thus claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons stated with respect to claim 1.

6. Claims 1 and 7 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz, in view of Wright, and further in view of either Moore et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,112,244, hereinafter "Moore"), or alternatively in view of Leuca et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,449, 287).

Both Moore and Leuca also disclose compressing electronic messages at a server, and sending the messages to a wireless device. See Moore, Abstract, Figs. 1 &

Art Unit: 2153

7; Leuca, Abstract. Thus, claims 1 and 7 are additionally rejected in view of these references for the same reasons stated with respect to Nakanura above.

7. Claims 2-6, 8, 10, 16, 18, 22, 24, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz, in view of Wright.

In considering claims 2-6, claims 2-6 contain no further limitations over claim 1, and merely separate the features disclosed in claim 1 into separate dependent claims. Thus, claims 2-6 are rejected for the same reasons as stated with respect to claim 1.

In considering claim 8, claim 8 contains the further limitations of detecting that a redirection trigger has occurred and generating a redirection trigger, receiving messages directed to a first address at the host system from plurality of message senders, and in response to the trigger, continuously redirecting messages between the host system and the mobile device via the secure link. These additional features are further taught by Woltz. See col. 2, lines 24-34, wherein a redirection "event" is a vacation, and the redirection "trigger" is the reaching of the actual time to begin redirection.

In considering claim 10, claim 10 contains the further limitation of storing information regarding the configuration of the mobile data communication device at the host system. This feature is further taught by Woltz. See col. 2, lines 11-15.

In considering claim 16, Woltz further discloses that the redirection events include external, internal, or networked events (col. 2, lines 31-34, "user definable hold blackout period").

In considering claim 18, Woltz further discloses that the internal event is a calendar alarm (a certain time when a user goes on vacation).

In considering claim 22, Woltz further discloses that the mobile device is a pager (Fig. 1).

In considering claim 24, Woltz further discloses a preferred list for redirecting messages (col. 7, lines 62-64).

In considering claim 34, claim 34 contains no further limitations over claim 2, except that it mentions the use of encryption and decryption keys to carry out the encryption. The use of such keys is further taught by Wright (col. 7, line 39 – col. 8, line 21).

8. Claims 11-12 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz and Wright, further in view of MobileVision (Mobile Vision User Manual, CE Software, Inc., 1995, hereinafter "MV").

In considering claim 11, Woltz further discloses that the configuration information stored at the host system includes the network address of the mobile device (col. 2, lines 14-16). However, Woltz does not disclose the information including an indication of the types of message attachments that the mobile device can receive and process. Nonetheless, including such an indication in a mobile device messaging system is well known, as evidenced by MV. In a similar art, MV discloses a server for redirecting messages to a mobile device (p. 2-6 – 2.8), wherein the server keeps profile information of the different mobile devices that it redirects messages to, wherein the server also keeps track of whether an attachment is of the type that can be received and displayed at a particular mobile device, and if so, then transmitting the attachment from the software program to the wireless mobile device (p. 4-32; "Enclosure" rules). A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including the attachment information in the system taught by Woltz and Wright, to save network bandwidth by avoiding sending large attachments that cannot be viewed at the recipient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include the attachment functions taught by MV in the message forwarding system taught by Woltz and Wright.

In considering claim 12, Woltz further discloses that the configuration information includes a pager type (col. 2, line 16).

In considering claims 25-29, MV further discloses that the preferred lists are activated and deactivated at the host system by a command from the mobile device, and further discloses that senders can be added or subtracted from the preferred list by configuring the host system via a command from the mobile device (pp. 4-26 – 4-29, “filtering your messages”). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include these features in the system taught by Woltz and Wright so that traveling users can control their message reception from the road.

9. Claims 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz, in view of Wright, and further in view of Moon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,146, hereinafter “Moon”).

In considering claim 17, although the system taught by Wright and Woltz discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose that redirection events can include a message from the mobile device to start redirection. Nonetheless, such redirection events in a message forwarding system are well known, as evidenced by Moon. In a similar art, Moon discloses a message forwarding system for redirecting messages from a host (server) to a mobile device, including encryption of the messages (col. 2, lines 24-55), wherein a redirection event to forward messages includes a message from the mobile device to start redirection (col. 3, lines 1-4; col. 6, lines 27-29). Given the teaching of Moon, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of allowing a user at the mobile device to determine when messages should be redirected to the mobile device, so that

Art Unit: 2153

traveling users can elect to receive messages at their mobile devices without having to visit a wired, networked computer. Thus, it would have been obvious for the redirection events disclosed by Woltz to include messages sent from the mobile device, as taught by Moon.

In considering claim 23, Moon further discloses that the mobile device is equipped to receive both voice and non-voice data (col. 4, lines 9-13, wherein the device is a cell phone). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use a cell phone to receive the redirected messages, so users who already own cell phones do not need to buy a separate device to receive redirected e-mail.

10. Claims 9, 13, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz and Wright, in view of Adler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,630, hereinafter "Adler").

In considering claim 9, Woltz further discloses receiving messages at the mobile device, transmitting reply messages from the mobile device to the host system and configuring the messages at the host system before sending the messages to message senders (col. 5, lines 25-40). However, neither Woltz nor Wright disclose that the reply messages necessarily use the first address associated with the host system as the originating address, or that messages generated at either the host system or the mobile device share the first address. Nonetheless, such features on two-way pagers are well known, as evidenced by Adler. In a similar art, Adler discloses a two-way pager system

wherein messages are received at a host and are forwarded to a mobile paging device, wherein reply messages are created at the mobile paging device and are sent to the host before being forwarded to the sender, and wherein the replies are reconfigured at the host to use the address associated with the host as the originating address and messages generated at either the host or the mobile device share the first address (col. 4, lines 5-10, 26-44; col. 5, line 65; wherein replies will be sent from the mobile device to the host server where they are correlated with the user's e-mail address before being sent out as a regular e-mail). Thus, given the teaching of Adler, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including the two-way paging features taught by Adler in the system taught by Woltz and Wright, so that the mobile users in the system taught by Woltz and Wright can access their private e-mail system via a pager device (see Adler, col. 1, lines 62-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the features taught by Adler in the system taught by Woltz and Wright.

In considering claim 13, Adler further discloses determining whether the receiver address is associated with the mobile device, if so then determining a network address of the mobile device and repackaging the messages into electronic envelopes addressed using the receiver address and the network address of the mobile device, and after receiving the messages at the mobile device, extracting the messages from the envelopes and displaying the messages using the sender and recipient addresses so it appears that the mobile device is the host system (col. 4, lines 27-43; Fig. 5).

In considering claim 42, claim 42 presents no further limitations over claims 9 and 13, and is thus rejected for the same reasons as stated above.

In considering claim 43, Woltz, Wright, and Adler all disclose that the mobile device can be a pager (see Abstracts).

11. Claims 1-8, 10, 16, 18, 22, 24, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz, in view of Frith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,943,426, hereinafter "Frith").

In considering claim 1, Woltz discloses an electronic message redirection system, as described previously.

However, Woltz does not discuss the packaging, encryption, and/or compression of messages sent between the host and the mobile device. Nonetheless, packaging, encrypting, and compressing messages sent between a host system and a wireless device is well known, as evidenced by Frith. In a similar art, Frith discloses a system for redirecting messages received at a host (sending gateway) connected to a wired network, through a gateway (receiving gateway), to a wireless device (node) connected to a wireless network (col. 2, lines 38-61; Fig. 1), wherein the messages are packaged and encrypted at the host and remain packaged and encrypted until they reach the destination pager, and wherein the pager extracts the messages, thus establishing a secure electronic message redirection system (col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 7; col. 7, lines

5-17). Frith further discloses compressing and decompressing the messages sent between the host and the mobile device (col. 3, lines 27-37).

Given the teachings of Frith, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of encrypting, packaging, and compressing the messages redirected from the host to the wireless device in the system taught by Woltz, in order to allow for a secure messaging system that conserves bandwidth, as taught by Frith. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include packaging, encryption, and compression, as taught by Frith, in the message redirection system taught by Woltz.

In considering claims 2-7, claims 2-7 contain no further limitations over claim 1, and merely separate the features disclosed in claim 1 into separate dependent claims. Thus, claims 2-7 are rejected for the same reasons as stated with respect to claim 1.

In considering claim 8, claim 8 contains the further limitations of detecting that a redirection trigger has occurred and generating a redirection trigger, receiving messages directed to a first address at the host system from plurality of message senders, and in response to the trigger, continuously redirecting messages between the host system and the mobile device via the secure link. These additional features are further taught by Woltz. See col. 2, lines 24-34, wherein a redirection "event" is a vacation, and the redirection "trigger" is the reaching of the actual time to begin redirection.

In considering claim 10, claim 10 contains the further limitation of storing information regarding the configuration of the mobile data communication device at the host system. This feature is further taught by Woltz. See col. 2, lines 11-15.

In considering claim 16, Woltz further discloses that the redirection events include external, internal, or networked events (col. 2, lines 31-34, "user definable hold blackout period").

In considering claim 18, Woltz further discloses that the internal event is a calendar alarm (a certain time when a user goes on vacation).

In considering claim 22, Woltz further discloses that the mobile device is a pager (Fig. 1).

In considering claim 24, Woltz further discloses a preferred list for redirecting messages (col. 7, lines 62-64).

In considering claim 34, claim 34 contains no further limitations over claim 2, except that it mentions the use of encryption and decryption keys to carry out the encryption. The use of such keys is further taught by Frith (col. 7, lines 5-17).

12. Claims 11-12 and 25-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz and Frith, further in view of MV, for the same reasons stated previously regarding MV.

13. Claims 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright, in view of Woltz, and further in view of Moon, for the same reasons stated previously regarding Moon.

14. Claims 9, 13, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz and Frith, in view of Adler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,630, hereinafter "Adler").

In considering claim 9, Woltz further discloses receiving messages at the mobile device, transmitting reply messages from the mobile device to the host system and configuring the messages at the host system before sending the messages to message senders (col. 5, lines 25-40). However, neither Woltz nor Frith disclose that the reply messages necessarily use the first address associated with the host system as the originating address, or that messages generated at either the host system or the mobile device share the first address. Nonetheless, such features on two-way pagers are well known, as evidenced by Adler. In a similar art, Adler discloses a two-way pager system wherein messages are received at a host and are forwarded to a mobile paging device, wherein reply messages are created at the mobile paging device and are sent to the

Art Unit: 2153

host before being forwarded to the sender, and wherein the replies are reconfigured at the host to use the address associated with the host as the originating address and messages generated at either the host or the mobile device share the first address (col. 4, lines 5-10, 26-44; col. 5, line 65; wherein replies will be sent from the mobile device to the host server where they are correlated with the user's e-mail address before being sent out as a regular e-mail). Thus, given the teaching of Adler, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of including the two-way paging features taught by Adler in the system taught by Woltz and Firth, so that the mobile users in the system taught by Woltz and Firth can access their private e-mail system via a pager device (see Adler, col. 1, lines 62-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the features taught by Adler in the system taught by Woltz and Firth.

In considering claim 13, Adler further discloses determining whether the receiver address is associated with the mobile device, if so then determining a network address of the mobile device and repackaging the messages into electronic envelopes addressed using the receiver address and the network address of the mobile device, and after receiving the messages at the mobile device, extracting the messages from the envelopes and displaying the messages using the sender and recipient addresses so it appears that the mobile device is the host system (col. 4, lines 27-43; Fig. 5).

In considering claim 42, claim 42 presents no further limitations over claims 9 and 13, and is thus rejected for the same reasons as stated above.

In considering claim 43, Woltz, Frith, and Adler all disclose that the mobile device can be a pager (see Abstracts, and Frith, col. 2, lines 40-44).

15. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz and Frith, in view of Dunker (CE Software Announces MobileVision, CE Software, Inc., 1995, hereinafter "Dunker").

In considering claim 21, although the system taught by Woltz and Frith discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose the networked events including messages to begin redirection from computer systems other than the mobile data communication device, which are connected to the host system via a wired network. In a similar art, Dunker discloses a system for forwarding messages from a host system to a mobile device, wherein a plurality of desktop systems are in communication with the host, and the operation of the forwarding program can be configured using one of the plurality of desktop systems (p. 1, paragraph 5, "rules can be modified at either the office or from the road"). Therefore, given the teaching of Dunker, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of allowing users at networked stations to control redirection of the system in case a user loses his/her mobile device and still wants to receive the messages. Therefore, it would have been obvious to control the forwarding of

messages in the system taught by Woltz and Frith via a networked computer, as taught by Dunker.

16. Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frith, in view of MV.

In considering claims 32 and 33, these claims include the additional limitations over claim 31 of a message server for receiving and storing messages according to user accounts (e-mail server) and encryption/decryption keys at the host and the mobile device. Frith further discloses the use of keys (col. 7, lines 5-17). In addition, in a similar art, MV discloses a message redirection system where messages are stored at a message server before being forwarded to the mobile device (p. 3-15; p. 4-24 – 4-25). Given the teaching of MV, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of incorporating the encryption system taught by Frith in the message redirection system taught by MV so that personal e-mails received on a PDA can be encrypted, thereby increasing security of the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to use the encryption system taught by Frith with the message forwarding system taught by MV.

In considering claim 34, MV further discloses configuring a redirection trigger, and continuously redirecting messages according to the trigger (p. 4-26 – 4.28, wherein messages are redirected upon setting a filter).

17. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz, Frith, and MV, in view of Moriya (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,140), and further in view of Theimer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,493,692, hereinafter "Theimer").

In considering claim 1, Woltz additionally discloses determining whether messages include attachments, and removing attachments and processing the messages accordingly (col. 6, lines 25-35). However, Woltz does not disclose determining the type of attachment, accessing stored configuration information at the host system to determine if the mobile device can process attachments of the determined type, and then redirecting the attachments to the mobile device or else redirecting the attachments to a device capable of processing the attachments. Nonetheless, these steps are well known, as evidenced by Moriya and Theimer, respectfully.

Moriya discloses an e-mail forwarding system for forwarding messages from a host to a mobile device, including separating an attachment from a message (col. 8, lines 35-38, 53-58), and redirecting the message from the host system to the mobile device (col. 8, lines 53-56). Moriya further discloses that attachments that the mobile device cannot receive (according to a mobile device profile database stored at the host) may be removed from the e-mail prior to the e-mail being forwarded to the mobile device (col. 8, lines 30-35). However, Moriya does not teach that the attachments can then be redirected from the host system to an appropriate device. Nonetheless, redirection of messages from a host system to a display device associated with a mobile device is well known, as evidenced by Theimer. In a similar art, Theimer

discloses a system for selectively delivering electronic messages to one or more users who are using a mobile communication device (col. 24, lines 49-55), wherein the messages will be redirected from a host (server) to an appropriate display device according to device characteristics, the context, and the message characteristics (col. 25, lines 17-38).

Thus, given the combined teaching of Moriya and Theimer, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of forwarding the attachments removed by the host in the system taught by Woltz, Frith, and MV to an appropriate display device, as taught by Moriya and Theimer, so that a user at a remote location can view the attachment immediately (see Theimer, col. 25, lines 23-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to forward the attachments taught by Woltz, Frith, and MV to a user via the display device system taught by Moriya and Theimer.

18. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woltz, Frith, and MV, in view of Moriya and Theimer, and further in view of Cooper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,442, hereinafter "Cooper").

In considering claim 15, Cooper further discloses that attachments to messages may be sound files, and that such attachments can be processed by an appropriate device (i.e. audio attachments may be played on a answering machine speaker, see col. 3, lines 25-28). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include audio attachments to the messages in the combined system taught by

Woltz, Frith, MV, Moriya, and Theimer, so that users can obtain important voice messages when on the road.

19. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuki (EP Patent No. 772,327 A2), in view of Frith, and further in view of Kumomura (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,219).

In considering claim 19, Kuki discloses a method of exchanging messages between a host system and a wireless mobile data communication device via a wireless communication network (col. 4, lines 10-20), including configuring one or more redirection events at the host system (col. 4, lines 50-54), detecting that a redirection event has occurred at the host and generating a redirection trigger, and in response to the trigger, exchanging messages between the host system and the mobile device by continuously redirecting the messages received at the host system to the mobile device (col. 5, lines 37-43; col. 6, lines 22-30). Kuki further discloses that the redirection event is an internal event (i.e. calendar alarm). Although Kuki does not explicitly disclose a wireless gateway for connecting the wired and wireless network, such a gateway is inherent and would be necessary to complete the wired-to-wireless communication.

In addition, although Kuki does not disclose the use of a secure link between the host system and the wireless device, such a link is well known, as taught by Frith (as discussed previously in this action).

Finally, although the system taught by Kuki teaches an internal event for triggering redirection of messages, it does not disclose that the event is a screen saver

activation. Nonetheless, the use of a screen saver activation to trigger redirection of electronic messages is well known in the art, as evidenced by Kumomura. In a similar art, Kumomura discloses a system for receiving electronic mail at a client machine, wherein received messages are redirected to another networked device if a screen saver is activated (col. 4, lines 58-61, 64-65). Thus, given the teaching of Kumomura, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of using a screen saver activation as a redirection event in the system taught by Kuki and Frith, so that a user who is most likely away from her host computer can still receive incoming messages at her mobile device (see Kumomura, col. 4, lines 61-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the screen saver activation feature taught by Kumomura in the message redirection system taught by Kuki and Frith.

20. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuki (EP Patent No. 772,327 A2), in view of Frith and Kumomura, and further in view of Rakavy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,913,040, hereinafter "Rakavy").

In considering claim 20 although the combined teaching of Kuki, Frith, and Kumomura does not explicitly discuss a keyboard timeout signal, the use keyboard timeout signals to trigger screen saver activation is well known, as evidenced by Rakavy. In a similar art, Rakavy discloses a system for triggering a network communication between a home computer and a remote computer, wherein a keyboard timeout will activate a screen saver and thus trigger the network communication (col. 7,

Art Unit: 2153

line 63 - col. 8, line 3). Given the teaching of Rakavy, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use a keyboard timeout to activate a screen saver, thereby activating redirection of the messages disclosed in the system taught by Kuki, Frith, and Kumomura, because (1) the use of keyboard timeout signals to trigger a screen saver activation is notoriously well known in the art, and (2) a keyboard timeout is likely to signify that a user is no longer near her computer. Thus, a user would want messages redirected to her mobile device if she is not near her computer. Therefore, it would have been obvious for an internal event in the system taught by Kuki, Frith, and Kumomura to include a keyboard timeout signal, as taught by Rakavy.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is (703) 306-3041. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:


For all After Final papers: (703) 746-7238.

For all other correspondences: (703) 746-7239.

Application/Control Number: 09/782,107
Art Unit: 2153

Page 27

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

BE
March 21, 2003